

From: [Casey, Carolyn](#)
To: [Ballew, Mary](#)
Cc: [Wainberg, Daniel](#)
Subject: FW: USM letter transmitting IDA sampling data
Date: Friday, July 06, 2018 5:03:00 PM
Attachments: [135C Letter 6 July 2018 EPA revised.docx](#)

Sorry I missed your call. Lots of information that I already know and sorry but not what I was looking for. I asked for your opinion on my letter which clearly does not include anything about the soil gas. Please see the redline below.

From: Casey, Carolyn
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 4:24 PM
To: Murphy, Jim <Murphy.Jim@epa.gov>; Ballew, Mary <ballew.mary@epa.gov>
Cc: Wainberg, Daniel <Wainberg.Daniel@epa.gov>; Zucker, Audrey <Zucker.Audrey@epa.gov>
Subject: USM letter transmitting IDA sampling data

Mary and Jim, Please see the attached docs. We are still trying to agree on a letter to transmit the indoor air (IDA) sampling data to tenants/parents at the facility.

-My draft for your review includes "track changes accepted" in file name.

-Their original doc is worth looking at to see how significant the changes are (pdf file) both in the amount of information provided and the conclusions.

-The other one is their doc with the track changes ("EPA revised" in file name). May or may not be the best way to see the changes.

Mary, is there anything you can't live with from a factual RA standpoint?

Jim, could you give it a quick skim and let me know if this is still way too much info?

I plan to use this one as a format for the other three letters although they will all have different conclusions. Wanted to get some initial feedback before I moved on so this is relatively urgent since it has taken us 3 long months to just get here.

- I think they provide way too much information with the soil gas data and the 3 step evaluation to be useful to the suite managers.
- I wanted this detailed evaluation from them in order to support their conclusions that they previously made in their first attempt at a letter, but I certainly did not expect them to put it all in a letter to the suite managers/parents transmitting results.
- Note that for this suite, these 2 (IDA) sampling rounds were the first. This suite became a daycare while we were working on the order.
- I still think their evaluation is still wrong so I left off table 3. Told them to compare max soil gas to minimum IDA concentrations if they did not have co-located samples. They compared max to max which is still not appropriate. Odd that they mention co-location in their letter though.
- I think the letter should come from Cummings, not Bruce so I got rid of their letter head.
- Thought I'd leave the risk assessment info in but I moved a lot of the RA text from the letter to

Appendix A. Jim, what do you think, still too much? My thought was to include the text with the MassDEP short forms, or is this too much?

Thanks in advance for your help with getting this long over-due info out!

Carolyn